DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 511 EA 026 083

AUTHOR Barnette, J. Jackson; Hange, Jane
TITLE Site-Based Decision Making Using Faculty Senates: Three Years of Experience in West Virginia.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advisory Committees; Elementary Secondary Education; *Participative Decision Making; *School Based Management; School Involvement; State Action; *State Legislation; *Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Senates (Elementary Secondary Schools); *West Virginia

ABSTRACT

The West Virginia education reform legislation of 1988 and 1990 mandated greater involvement of school personnel, parents, and community in site-based decision making. This paper examines the operations and activities of faculty senates, which are composed of all full-time educators in each school, for the years 1990-91, 1991-92, and 1992-93. A survey administered to delegates who attended the 1991, 1992, and 1993 West Virginia Education Association Delegate Assemblies yielded 176, 129, and 212 responses, respectively, an approximate 75 percent compliance rate. Respondents indicated increasing faculty involvement in school-based decision making; however, they expressed declining support for decisions and less satisfaction with senate operations within the 3-year period. They most frequently mentioned the need for training, role clarification, and greater support from the school and district administrations. Eight tables are included. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 374 511

Site-Based Decision Making Using Faculty Senates: Three Years of Experience in West Virginia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. E. Hange

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

J. Jackson Barnette
University of Alabama
P.O. Box 870231
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0231

and

Jane Hange
Appalachia Educational Laboratory
P. O. Box 1348
Charleston, WV 25325

Presented at the 1994 Annual Meeting of
American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, LA

EA026083

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The West Virginia education reform legislation of 1988 and 1990 mandated greater involvement of school personnel, parents and community in site-based decision-making. This included establishment of school advisory councils, district professional staff development councils, school improvement councils, and establishment of faculty senates. This paper concentrates on the operations and activities of faculty senates in 1990-91, 1991-92, and 1992-93, with a comparison of these three years of experience on several dimensions: educational personnel involvement, areas in which faculty senates have made decisions, how meeting time has been spent, topics of senate meetings, satisfaction with meeting characteristics, how decisions are made in meetings, and effects of senate actions. Faculty senates were to be made up of all full-time professional educators in the school and were to be involved in making decisions and recommendations.

Perspectives

Many states and local school systems have initiated or are in the process of considering establishment of site-based decision-making approaches for increasing local personnel involvement and ownership of educational decisions. The West Virginia experience, over three years, provides a look at faculty perceptions of this strategy when mandated by state law.

Methods

A survey was designed to assess perceptions of how these faculty senates were organized, operated, and their effects in the first, second, and third years of existence. The survey focused on the following: respondent demographic characteristics, senate meeting participation, senate actions and decisions, time spent on various meeting activities, satisfaction with senate meetings, how senate decisions are made, and the effects of senate actions. The same survey was administered to similar sample groups in 1991, 1992, and 1993, so these three years could be compared.

Data Sources

The survey was administered to delegates attending the 1991, 1992, and 1993 West Virginia Education Association Delegate Assemblies. While it was voluntary for these delegates to complete the survey, more than 75% of the delegates did complete the survey. Since the survey was administered all three times to the same type of respondents, there is a sound basis for comparing the three years of experience. In addition, demographic characteristics and characteristics of the schools they represented were very similar between all three respondent groups. Table 1 presents results on demographic variables. There were 176 respondents for the 1991 survey, 129 for the 1992 survey, and 212 for the 1993 survey. A large majority (95%) of the respondents were teachers and the most of the remaining respondents were librarians or guidance counselors. More than 70% held masters' degrees. Eighty-five percent of the

respondents had more than ten years of professional experience and 64% had more than ten years of experience in their present school. Relative to types of schools, 42.6% of the respondents were from elementary schools, 20.6% were from middle or junior high schools, and 26.8% were from high schools. Most of the schools (54.7%) were from schools in rural settings, while 24.4% indicated they were from suburban schools and 21% indicated they were from urban schools. A majority (58.8%) of the respondents were from schools with enrollments of 200 to 600. The average faculty size was 35.5 and the average administrator size was 1.8.

Results

Meeting Characteristics

Table 2 presents results for characteristics of the faculty senate meetings. In 1991, 97%, in 1992, 98%, and in 1993, 100% of the respondents indicated senate meetings were held on a monthly basis. The average number of meetings held in 1990-91 was 7.4, in 1991-92 it was 8.8, and in 1992-93 there was an average of 8.9 meetings during the year, an average of 8.4 meetings per year. Respondents attended an average of 7.8 meetings per year. Clearly, the respondent group was present at almost all of the faculty senate meetings.

Release time was to be provided for senate meetings, a total of two hours per month during regular school day time. Ninety-seven percent of the respondents indicated that release time had been provided for faculty senate meetings. It was interesting to note that the percentage decreased over the three years, from 100% in 1990-91, 98% in 1991-92, and 94% in 1992-93.

Respondents indicated, in all three years, that more than 90% of the faculty participated in faculty senate meetings. Participants included most of the principals, assistant principals, teachers, guidance counselors, and itinerant teachers. There were much lower incidences of participation by support personnel and central office personnel.

Areas of Faculty Senate Decision-Making

Respondents were asked to indicate if their faculty senates had made decisions related to certain areas. Table 3 presents the results on these areas, by year and for the total respondent group. Three areas were clearly indicated as having been done by faculty senates of more than 90% of the respondents. These were: election of Faculty Senate chair, vice chair, and secretary (99.4%); expenditure of legislature-appropriated teacher instructional materials or equipment funds (96.1%); and nomination of teachers to School Improvement Council (93.6%). These percentages were consistent across the three years.

Three areas were cited next most often as having occurred by the respondents, all by more than 50% of the respondents. These were: establishment of recognition programs at the school (56.9%); nomination of teachers for recognition as outstanding teachers under state and local recognition programs (51.5%); and nomination of faculty members for election to the district staff development council (51.5%). Of these, two demonstrated more of a frequency of these happening in later years of faculty senate activity than in the first year. These were: establishment of recognition programs at the school and nomination of teachers for recognition as outstanding teachers under state and local recognition programs.

Two areas were indicated by about 30 to 40% of the respondents as having been conducted: recommendation to the principal regarding establishment of the master curriculum schedule for the next school year (42.4%) and establishment of procedures for soliciting, accepting, and expending grants, gifts, bequests, donations, or other funds made available to the Faculty Senate (30.9%).

Four areas had responses at about 20%. These were: nomination of other personnel at the school, including parents, for recognition under appropriate recognition programs (23.0%); recommendation to the principal regarding assignment scheduling of secretaries, clerks, aides, and paraprofessionals (21.1%); recommendation to the principal regarding selection of faculty to serve as mentors for beginning teachers under beginning teacher internships at the school (20.7%); and review of teacher evaluation procedures as conducted in school to ascertain whether such evaluations were conducted in accordance with the written system pursuant to state code (19.1%).

The areas were rated as having low occurrences of happening in faculty senate decision areas. They were: establishment of process for faculty members to interview new prospective professional educators and paraprofessional employees (12.2%) and establishment of a process for review/comment on sabbatical leave requests submitted by employees at the school (2.7%).

How Time Spent in Faculty Senate Meetings

One set of survey items asked respondents to indicate the percentage of faculty senate time spent in various activities. Table 4 presents results for these items. There was a wide variety types of activities, but clearly the highest percentage of time (39.3%) was spend discussing items on the agenda. Information provision accounted for about 14% of the time and decision-making accounted for about 12% of the time. Other activities took up lower percentages of time. These were: consensus reaching (6.6%), arguments and conflict resolution (6.3%), reporting actions since last meeting (6.2%), outlining/assigning group/individual tasks (4.9%), discussion unrelated to agenda items (4.3%), approving

minutes of last meeting (2.1%), agenda setting for this meeting (1.5%), and planning next meeting (1.2%).

Respondents were asked to check if other activities had taken place in faculty senate meetings. Table 5 presents results for these items. Of these activities, 75% or more of the respondents indicated that the activities of: information provision by administrators (97%), faculty member presentations (94%), future planning (91%), committee meetings (79%), "Gripe" sessions (87%), and curriculum development (77%), occurred occasionally or often. Less frequently cited were: grade level/department meetings (65%), program review/evaluation (73%), and faculty or school scheduling (69%). Clearly the least cited activity was student presentations/ discussions, cited as happening occasionally or often by only 14% of the respondents.

Satisfaction with Meeting Characteristics

Respondents were asked to rate on a 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied) point scale. Results for these items are presented in Table 6. Clearly, two characteristics were rated highest in terms of satisfaction. They were: frequency of meetings (M= 4.4 and 87% indicated somewhat or very satisfied) and opportunities for involvement in discussion (M= 4.2 and 80% indicated somewhat or very satisfied). Five characteristics were rated next highest, each with more than 65% of the respondents indicating somewhat or very satisfied. These were: meeting leadership (M= 3.9 and 69% indicated somewhat or very satisfied), meeting parliamentary procedures/ operations (M= 3.8 and 69% indicated somewhat or very satisfied), communication in advance of meetings (M= 3.8 and 69% indicated somewhat or very satisfied), focus on school problems (M= 3.7 and 67% indicated somewhat or very satisfied), and agenda setting process (M=3.7 and 66% indicated somewhat or very satisfied).

Eight characteristics were rated as being somewhat or very satisfied by 53% to 61% of the respondents and with means of 3.4 to 3.6. These were: topics of discussion (M= 3.6 and 60% indicated somewhat or very satisfied), committee structure (M=3.6 and 60% indicated somewhat or very satisfied), focus on students (M= 3.6 and 61% indicated somewhat or very satisfied), participation by faculty in decision-making (M= 3.5 and 58% indicated somewhat or very satisfied), decision-making processes used (M= 3.5 and 57% indicated somewhat or very satisfied), decisions made/actions taken (M= 3.5 and 60% indicated somewhat or very satisfied), follow-through on decisions by faculty/staff (M= 3.5 and 58% indicated somewhat or very satisfied), and communications after meetings (M=3.4 and 53% indicated somewhat or very satisfied).

Four characteristics were clearly rated lower than those mentioned above. They were: participation by administrators in decision-making (M= 3.1 and 45% indicated somewhat or very

satisfied), follow-through on decisions by administrators (M= 3.0 and 40% indicated somewhat or very satisfied), participation by support staff in decision-making (M= 2.8 and 30% indicated somewhat or very satisfied), and, clearly the lowest rated characteristic in terms of respondent satisfaction, was participation by students in decision-making (M= 2.4 and only 16% indicated somewhat or very satisfied).

How Decisions are Made in Faculty Senate Meetings

A set of survey items asked respondents to indicate how decisions were made in faculty senate meetings, results of which are presented in Table 7. Clearly, the most frequently indicated method, cited as happening by 91% of the respondents, was majority vote. Thirty-three percent indicated consensus reaching until compromise decision was used, 21% indicated consensus reaching until unanimous decision was used, and 15% indicated consensus reaching until majority agree with dissenters able to suggest changes was used.

Other, less cited modes were: administration makes most decisions outside meeting (10.4%), small group of faculty with or without administration makes most decisions (8.2%), administration makes most decisions within meeting (3.4%), faculty senate chair makes most decisions (3.2%), faculty senate chair with administration makes most decisions (3.2%), and decisions are not made in faculty senate meetings (3.0%)

Support for and Effects of Faculty Senate Decisions

A series of items assessed perceptions of support for and effects of faculty senate decisions. Results for these items are presented in Table 8. Four of the items related to support for faculty senate decisions. Eighty percent indicated that decisions were supported by a majority of faculty, 51% indicated decisions were supported by school administration, and 17% indicated decisions were supported by central administration. Sixty-six percent of the respondents indicated they supported faculty senate decisions.

When asked how faculty senate decisions had resulted in changes, 46% of the respondents felt they had changed school policies and goals, 39% felt they had changed school leadership practices, and 31% felt they had changed instructional practices/ curriculum, but only six percent indicated decisions had changed their teaching. In addition, 54% felt the decisions had affected students and 28% felt the decisions had affected community/parents.

Educational Importance

Site-based decision-making has been touted as a way of increasing faculty involvement and ownership in dealing with local school decisions. In the West Virginia case, this has been mandated by the state legislature. Based on these data, it seems that there has been support and increased involvement of faculty in decision-making. However, it seems that support for decisions and satisfaction with senate operations has declined somewhat from the first year to second and third years of the faculty senate operation. There is further need to assess faculty expectations and how these types of programs meet those expectations and determine contextual factors which relate to the success of implementing such programs. Perhaps it should not be assumed that faculty are eager for such mandated programs or are prepared to utilize them in the most appropriate and useful manner. A few of the most frequently made comments were the need for training, the need for role clarification, and greater support from school and district administration.

Additional data analysis is being conducted to compare survey results by school type (elementary, middle/junior high, and high school) and by school setting (rural, suburban, and urban). Results of this analysis may be obtained by writing either of the authors.

Table 1. Demographics

Respondent Group Sizes: Year 1 (Y1), 1990-91 n= 176
Year 2 (Y2), 1991-92 n= 129
Year 3 (Y3), 1992-93 n= 212
Total (Tot) n= 517

Year	Y1		Y2		Y3		Total	
Position	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Teacher	165	93.8	124	96.1	202	95.3	491	95.0
Principal/ Asst. Prin.	2	1.1	1	0.8	4	1.9	7	1.4
Other	9	5.1	4	3.1	6	2.8	19	3.7

Year	Y1		Y2		Y3		Total	
Degree	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Bachelors	46	26.1	44	34.4	56	26.4	146	28.3
Masters	23	13.1	13	10.2	31	14.6	67	13.0
Beyond Masters	107	60.8	71	55.5	124	58.5	302	58.5
Ph.D./Ed.D.	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.5	1	0.2

Years of experience in profession

Year	Y1		Y2		Y3		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0 - 3	4	2.3	0	0.0	1	0.5	5	1.0
4 - 7	11	6.3	8	6.3	9	4.3	28	5.5
8 - 10	15	8.6	9	7.1	19	9.0	43	8.4
11 - 15	40	23.0	22	17.3	38	18.0	100	19.5
16 - 20	59	33.9	46	36.2	68	32.2	173	33.8
21 - 30	44	25.3	41	32.3	72	34.1	157	30.7
31 or more	1	0.6	1	0.8	4	1.9	6	1.2
Blank	2		2		1		5	

Years of experience in school

Year	Y1		Y2		Y3		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0 - 3	26	15.1	13	10.1	18	8.6	57	11.2
4 - 7	24	14.0	17	13.2	36	17.1	77	15.1
8 - 10	14	8.1	13	10.1	23	11.0	50	9.8
11 - 15	40	23.3	27	20.9	40	19.0	107	20.9
16 - 20	49	28.5	35	27.1	42	20.0	126	24.7
21 - 30	19	11.0	23	17.8	47	22.4	89	17.4
31 or more	0	0.0	1	0.8	4	1.9	5	1.0
Blank	4		0		2		6	

Table 1. Demographics, continued

School level

Year	Y1		Y2		Y3		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Elementary	69	39.7	51	39.5	99	46.9	219	42.6
Middle/Jr. High	35	20.1	30	23.3	41	19.4	106	20.6
High School	49	28.2	36	27.9	53	25.1	138	26.8
K - 8	11	6.3	6	4.7	9	4.3	26	5.1
K - 12	3	1.7	4	3.1	5	2.4	12	2.3
Other	7	4.0	2	1.6	4	1.9	13	2.5
Blank	2		0		1		3	

School setting

Year	Y1		Y2		Y3		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Rural	89	51.4	64	51.2	123	59.4	276	54.7
Suburban	44	25.4	35	28.0	44	21.3	123	24.4
Urban	40	23.1	26	20.8	40	19.3	106	21.0
Blank	3		4		5		12	

School enrollment

Year	Y1		Y2		Y3		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0 - 100	2	1.1	5	3.9	4	1.9	11	2.1
101 - 200	16	9.1	13	10.1	26	12.3	55	10.7
201 - 400	67	38.3	45	34.9	72	34.1	184	35.7
401 - 600	42	24.0	27	20.9	50	23.7	119	23.1
601 - 1000	33	18.9	24	18.6	41	19.4	98	19.0
1000 +	15	8.6	15	11.6	18	8.5	48	9.3
Blank	1		0		1		2	

		Year	n	M	SD
Faculty size	Teachers	Y1	173	35.8	21.3
		Y2	127	37.0	25.3
		Y3	200	34.4	21.2
		Tot	500	35.5	22.3
	Administrators	Y1	163	1.7	1.2
		Y2	124	1.7	1.0
		Y3	192	1.8	1.4
		Tot	479	1.8	1.2

Table 2. Faculty Senate Meeting Participation

Have meetings occurred monthly

Year	Y1		Y2		Y3		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	170	96.6	127	98.4	212	100.0	509	98.5
No	6	3.4	2	1.6	0	0.0	8	1.5

	Year	n	M	SD
Number of meetings held	Y1	174	7.4	1.2
	Y2	129	8.8	1.2
	Y3	212	8.9	0.9
	Tot	515	8.4	1.3

	Year	n	M	SD
Number of meetings attended	Y1	174	6.9	1.4
	Y2	129	8.2	1.4
	Y3	212	8.3	1.3
	Tot	515	7.8	1.5

Has released time been provided

Year	Y1		Y2		Y3		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	175	100.0	127	98.4	199	93.9	501	97.1
No	0	0.0	2	1.6	13	6.1	15	2.9
Blank	1							

Have additional meetings been held

Year	Y1		Y2		Y3		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	62	35.6	63	50.0	90	43.1	215	42.2
No	112	64.4	63	50.0	119	56.9	294	57.8
Blank	2		3		3		8	

	Year	n	M	SD
Number of additional meetings	Y1	168	0.7	1.2
	Y2	62	1.4	0.5
	Y3	207	0.7	1.0
	Tot	437	0.8	1.1

Table 2. Faculty Senate Meeting Participation, continued

	Year	n	M	SD
Percentage of faculty participating	Y1	175	92.5	10.7
	Y2	128	91.0	14.0
	Y3	209	90.6	15.1
	Tot	512	91.3	13.5

How percentage changed

Year	Y1		Y2		Y3		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Increased	12	7.1	9	7.0	20	9.6	41	8.1
Decreased	13	7.6	7	5.5	21	10.0	41	8.1
No change	144	84.7	112	87.5	168	80.4	424	83.6
Blank	7		1		3		11	

Year / Serves as chair	Y1 f	Y1 %	Y2 f	Y2 %	Y3 f	Y3 %	Total f	Total %
Principal	5	2.8	0	0.0	2	1.0	7	1.4
Dept. chair/ lead teacher	7	4.0	6	4.7	7	3.3	20	3.9
Teacher	160	90.9	122	94.6	199	94.8	481	93.4
Other	4	2.3	1	0.8	2	1.0	7	1.4

Year / Participants	Y1 f	Y1 %	Y2 f	Y2 %	Y3 f	Y3 %	Total f	Total %
Principal	169	96.0	123	96.1	195	93.8	487	95.5
Asst. prin.	78	44.3	55	43.0	84	40.4	217	42.5
Guidance counselor	111	63.1	73	57.0	120	57.7	304	59.6
Itinerant tchr.	94	53.4	58	45.3	85	40.9	237	46.5
Support personnel	24	13.6	15	11.7	31	14.9	70	13.7
Central office/supt	9	5.1	2	1.6	7	3.4	18	3.5

Table 3. Faculty Senate Actions and Decisions
Areas in which decisions have been made

	Year	Checked f	Checked %
Nomination of teachers to School Improvement Council	Y1	166	94.3
	Y2	123	95.3
	Y3	195	92.0
	Tot	484	93.6
Expenditure of legislature-appropriated teacher instructional materials or equipment funds	Y1	171	97.2
	Y2	124	96.1
	Y3	202	95.3
	Tot	497	96.1
Election of Faculty Senate chair, vice chair, and secretary	Y1	175	99.4
	Y2	129	100.0
	Y3	210	99.1
	Tot	514	99.4
Establishment of process for faculty members to interview new prospective professional educators and paraprofessional employees	Y1	15	8.5
	Y2	18	14.0
	Y3	30	14.2
	Tot	63	12.2
Nomination of teachers for recognition as outstanding teachers under state and local recognition programs	Y1	65	36.9
	Y2	67	51.9
	Y3	134	63.2
	Tot	266	51.5
Nomination of other personnel at the school, including parents, for recognition under appropriate recognition programs	Y1	36	20.5
	Y2	25	19.4
	Y3	58	27.4
	Tot	119	23.0
Establishment of recognition programs at the school	Y1	88	50.0
	Y2	71	55.0
	Y3	135	63.7
	Tot	294	56.9
Recommendation to the principal regarding assignment scheduling of secretaries, clerks, aides, and paraprofessionals	Y1	42	23.9
	Y2	18	14.0
	Y3	49	23.1
	Tot	109	21.1
Recommendation to the principal regarding establishment of the master curriculum schedule for the next school year	Y1	70	39.8
	Y2	43	33.3
	Y3	106	50.0
	Tot	219	42.4
Nomination of faculty member for election to the district staff development council	Y1	86	48.9
	Y2	53	41.1
	Y3	127	59.9
	Tot	266	51.5

Table 3. Faculty Senate Actions and Decisions, continued
Areas in which decisions have been made

	Year	Checked f	Checked %
Recommendation to the principal regarding selection of faculty to serve as mentors for beginning teachers under beginning teacher internships at the school	Y1	28	15.9
	Y2	30	23.3
	Y3	49	23.1
	Tot	107	20.7
Review of teacher evaluation procedures as conducted in school to ascertain whether such evaluations were conducted in accordance with the written system pursuant to state code 18A-2-12	Y1	16	9.1
	Y2	17	13.2
	Y3	66	31.1
	Tot	99	19.1
Establishment of a process for review/comment on sabbatical leave requests submitted by employees at the school	Y1	5	2.8
	Y2	5	3.9
	Y3	4	1.9
	Tot	14	2.7
Establishment of procedures for soliciting, accepting, and expending grants, gifts, bequests, donations, or other funds made available to the Faculty Senate	Y1	48	27.3
	Y2	36	27.9
	Y3	76	35.8
	Tot	160	30.9

Table 4. Faculty Senate Actions and Decisions
How time is spent in an average Faculty Senate meeting

	Year	Checked or % entered f	%	Value entered n	M	SD
Information provision	Y1	131	81.9	119	13.8	17.4
	Y2	93	76.2	105	12.1	14.4
	Y3	143	74.5	152	15.7	18.6
	Tot	367	77.4	376	14.1	17.1
Agenda setting for this meeting	Y1	47	29.4	119	1.5	3.3
	Y2	36	29.5	105	1.4	3.2
	Y3	46	24.0	152	1.6	5.7
	Tot	129	27.2	376	1.5	4.4
Discussion of items on agenda	Y1	151	94.4	119	37.0	25.0
	Y2	117	95.9	105	40.6	23.9
	Y3	174	90.6	152	40.1	27.4
	Tot	442	93.2	376	39.3	25.7
Decision-making	Y1	132	83.0	118	11.6	11.4
	Y2	107	87.7	105	12.4	10.1
	Y3	150	78.1	152	10.8	10.9
	Tot	389	82.2	375	11.5	10.9
Consensus reaching	Y1	108	67.9	118	7.5	8.6
	Y2	81	66.4	105	6.2	7.9
	Y3	107	55.7	152	6.2	8.1
	Tot	296	62.6	375	6.6	8.2
Outlining/assigning group/individual tasks	Y1	110	69.2	118	6.2	10.2
	Y2	70	57.4	105	3.8	5.0
	Y3	102	53.1	152	4.6	6.9
	Tot	282	59.6	375	4.9	7.7
Discussion unrelated to agenda items	Y1	89	56.3	118	3.6	5.7
	Y2	71	58.2	105	4.3	5.5
	Y3	93	48.4	152	4.8	8.1
	Tot	253	53.6	375	4.3	6.7
Reporting actions since last meeting	Y1	125	79.1	117	6.7	8.8
	Y2	99	81.1	105	6.6	6.5
	Y3	134	69.8	152	5.5	5.7
	Tot	358	75.8	374	6.2	7.0
Arguments and conflict resolution	Y1	100	63.3	117	6.9	11.7
	Y2	72	59.0	105	6.3	10.4
	Y3	87	45.3	152	6.0	12.3
	Tot	259	54.9	374	6.3	11.6

Table 4. Faculty Senate Actions and Decisions, continued
How time is spent in an average Faculty Senate meeting

	Year	Checked or % entered f	%	Value entered n	M	SD
Approving minutes of last meeting	Y1	125	79.1	117	2.4	3.4
	Y2	101	82.8	105	2.0	1.9
	Y3	126	65.6	152	1.9	2.5
	Tot	352	74.6	374	2.1	2.7
Planning next meeting	Y1	53	33.5	117	1.4	3.1
	Y2	41	33.6	105	1.1	1.9
	Y3	53	27.6	152	1.2	2.5
	Tot	147	31.1	374	1.2	2.6

Table 5. Faculty Senate Actions and Decisions
Frequency of other activities occurring during Faculty Senate meetings

	Year	n	Never f	Never %	Occas. f	Occas. %	Often f	Often %
Information provision by administrators	Y1	166	8	4.8	82	49.4	76	45.8
	Y2	124	4	3.2	53	42.7	67	54.0
	Y3	201	5	2.5	103	51.2	93	46.3
	Tot	491	17	3.5	238	48.5	236	48.1
Faculty member presentations	Y1	162	16	9.9	77	47.5	69	42.6
	Y2	122	7	5.7	78	63.9	37	30.3
	Y3	197	7	3.6	121	61.4	69	35.0
	Tot	481	30	6.2	276	57.4	175	36.4
Student presentations/ discussions	Y1	149	132	88.6	16	10.7	1	0.7
	Y2	119	106	89.1	11	9.2	2	1.7
	Y3	176	144	81.8	29	16.5	3	1.7
	Tot	444	382	86.0	56	12.6	6	1.4
Curriculum development	Y1	162	35	21.6	95	58.6	32	19.8
	Y2	120	37	30.8	64	53.3	19	15.8
	Y3	193	37	19.2	119	61.7	37	19.2
	Tot	475	109	22.9	278	58.5	88	18.5
Faculty or school scheduling	Y1	160	49	30.6	84	52.5	27	16.9
	Y2	122	47	38.5	64	52.5	11	9.0
	Y3	188	48	25.5	112	59.6	28	14.9
	Tot	470	144	30.6	260	55.3	66	14.0
Program review/ evaluation	Y1	153	46	30.1	84	54.9	23	15.0
	Y2	122	38	31.1	63	51.6	21	17.2
	Y3	176	36	20.5	115	65.3	25	14.2
	Tot	451	120	26.6	262	58.1	69	15.3
Future planning	Y1	159	19	11.9	79	49.7	61	38.4
	Y2	122	12	9.8	71	58.2	39	32.0
	Y3	181	13	7.2	115	63.5	53	29.3
	Tot	462	44	9.5	265	57.4	153	33.1
Grade level/dept. meetings	Y1	154	61	39.6	67	43.5	26	16.9
	Y2	114	41	36.0	57	50.0	16	14.0
	Y3	179	56	31.3	91	50.8	32	17.9
	Tot	447	158	35.3	215	48.1	74	16.6
Committee meetings	Y1	157	34	21.7	72	45.9	51	32.5
	Y2	120	22	18.3	60	50.0	38	31.7
	Y3	175	38	21.7	79	45.1	58	33.1
	Tot	452	94	20.8	211	46.7	147	32.5
"Gripe" sessions	Y1	156	21	13.5	100	64.1	35	22.4
	Y2	119	18	15.1	69	58.0	32	26.9
	Y3	184	22	12.0	107	58.2	55	29.9
	Tot	459	61	13.3	276	60.1	122	26.6

Table 6. Perceptions of Faculty Senate Meeting Effectiveness
Satisfaction with meeting characteristics

	Year	n	Percent Response 1 Very dis.	2 Some dis.	3 Neutral	4 Some sat.	5 Very sat.	M	SD
Frequency of meetings	Y1	173	3	6	3	28	61	4.4	1.0
	Y2	126	2	2	11	21	64	4.5	0.9
	Y3	205	3	2	8	18	68	4.4	1.0
	Tot	504	3	3	7	22	65	4.4	1.0
Topics of discussion	Y1	172	4	17	6	42	30	3.8	1.2
	Y2	127	6	13	31	32	18	3.4	1.1
	Y3	203	6	11	29	36	19	3.5	1.1
	Tot	502	5	14	22	37	23	3.6	1.1
Opportunities for involvement in discussion	Y1	173	3	6	4	28	60	4.4	1.0
	Y2	127	4	8	13	29	46	4.0	1.1
	Y3	202	5	7	12	29	47	4.1	1.1
	Tot	502	4	7	9	29	51	4.2	1.1
Participation by faculty in decision-making	Y1	173	10	12	6	35	36	3.8	1.3
	Y2	127	13	14	24	32	16	3.2	1.3
	Y3	203	12	12	23	29	25	3.4	1.3
	Tot	503	12	13	18	32	26	3.5	1.3
Participation by administrators in decision-making	Y1	171	12	23	14	29	22	3.3	1.4
	Y2	126	21	18	21	28	13	2.9	1.4
	Y3	199	19	17	23	24	17	3.0	1.4
	Tot	496	17	19	19	27	18	3.1	1.4
Participation by support staff in decision-making	Y1	101	12	8	57	16	7	3.0	1.0
	Y2	70	27	14	26	16	17	2.8	1.4
	Y3	167	36	12	19	18	16	2.7	1.5
	Tot	338	27	11	32	17	13	2.8	1.4
Participation by students in decision-making	Y1	92	12	17	62	9	0	2.7	0.8
	Y2	50	36	20	20	12	12	2.4	1.4
	Y3	156	44	17	20	7	12	2.2	1.4
	Tot	298	33	18	33	8	8	2.4	1.2
Decision-making processes used	Y1	172	10	12	4	41	34	3.8	1.3
	Y2	125	9	10	37	33	11	3.3	1.1
	Y3	198	11	11	30	28	20	3.4	1.2
	Tot	495	10	11	23	34	23	3.5	1.2
Committee structure	Y1	172	8	8	10	43	32	3.8	1.2
	Y2	124	8	12	28	35	17	3.4	1.1
	Y3	198	9	9	30	29	23	3.5	1.2
	Tot	494	8	9	23	35	25	3.6	1.2

Table 6. Perceptions of Faculty Senate Meeting Effectiveness, continued
Satisfaction with meeting characteristics

			Percent Response						
			1	2	3	4	5		
	Year	n	Very dis.	Some dis.	Neutral	Some sat.	Very sat.	M	SD
Meeting parliamentary procedures/ operations	Y1	171	6	10	9	37	38	3.9	1.2
	Y2	124	10	7	16	37	30	3.7	1.2
	Y3	199	10	7	21	36	27	3.6	1.2
	Tot	494	8	8	15	37	32	3.8	1.2
Meeting leadership	Y1	171	8	5	11	25	52	4.1	1.2
	Y2	125	10	9	18	29	35	3.7	1.3
	Y3	201	9	8	17	29	36	3.8	1.3
	Tot	497	9	7	15	28	41	3.9	1.3
Focus on students	Y1	171	6	14	11	40	29	3.7	1.2
	Y2	125	12	13	14	37	24	3.5	1.3
	Y3	197	11	13	23	26	27	3.5	1.3
	Tot	493	9	13	17	34	27	3.6	1.3
Focus on school problems	Y1	172	8	13	2	40	36	3.8	1.3
	Y2	126	8	9	18	41	24	3.6	1.2
	Y3	200	8	7	25	32	29	3.7	1.2
	Tot	498	8	10	16	37	30	3.7	1.2
Agenda setting process	Y1	172	8	5	7	36	45	4.1	1.2
	Y2	126	8	12	23	25	32	3.6	1.3
	Y3	197	10	13	19	28	30	3.6	1.3
	Tot	495	9	10	16	30	36	3.7	1.3
Communication in advance of meetings	Y1	172	4	9	3	37	48	4.2	1.1
	Y2	126	6	10	22	29	32	3.7	1.2
	Y3	202	6	11	22	32	28	3.6	1.2
	Tot	500	5	10	16	33	36	3.8	1.2
Communications after meetings	Y1	168	7	14	11	44	25	3.7	1.2
	Y2	126	7	20	29	26	18	3.3	1.2
	Y3	196	11	17	30	27	16	3.2	1.2
	Tot	490	8	17	23	33	20	3.4	1.2
Decisions made/ actions taken	Y1	170	5	11	7	50	27	3.8	1.1
	Y2	124	9	11	23	44	13	3.4	1.1
	Y3	198	10	14	29	29	19	3.3	1.2
	Tot	492	8	12	20	40	20	3.5	1.2
Follow-through on decisions by faculty/staff	Y1	171	5	14	7	52	22	3.7	1.1
	Y2	126	9	16	25	36	14	3.3	1.2
	Y3	200	11	13	29	30	19	3.3	1.2
	Tot	497	8	14	21	39	19	3.5	1.2
Follow-through on decisions by administrators	Y1	168	15	21	8	40	17	3.2	1.4
	Y2	126	23	19	30	16	12	2.7	1.3
	Y3	200	17	22	28	24	11	2.9	1.2
	Tot	494	18	21	22	27	13	3.0	1.3

Table 7. Perceptions of Faculty Senate Meeting Effectiveness
How decisions are made in Faculty Senate meetings

	Year	Checked f	Checked %
Majority vote	Y1	152	88.9
	Y2	120	96.0
	Y3	181	88.7
	Tot	453	90.6
Consensus reaching until unanimous decision	Y1	42	24.6
	Y2	21	16.8
	Y3	40	19.6
	Tot	103	20.6
Consensus reaching until compromise decision	Y1	70	40.9
	Y2	38	30.4
	Y3	55	27.0
	Tot	163	32.6
Consensus reaching until majority agree with dissenters able to suggest changes	Y1	33	19.3
	Y2	22	17.6
	Y3	20	9.8
	Tot	75	15.0
Faculty Senate chair makes most decisions	Y1	3	1.8
	Y2	2	1.6
	Y3	3	1.5
	Tot	8	1.6
Faculty Senate chair with administration makes most decisions	Y1	7	4.1
	Y2	2	1.6
	Y3	7	3.4
	Tot	16	3.2
Administration makes most decisions within meeting	Y1	4	2.3
	Y2	5	4.0
	Y3	8	3.9
	Tot	17	3.4
Small group of faculty with or without administration makes most decisions	Y1	14	8.2
	Y2	13	10.4
	Y3	14	6.9
	Tot	41	8.2
Administration makes most decisions outside meeting	Y1	16	9.4
	Y2	17	13.6
	Y3	19	9.3
	Tot	52	10.4
Decisions are not made in Faculty Senate meetings	Y1	7	4.1
	Y2	5	4.0
	Y3	3	1.5
	Tot	15	3.0

Table 8. Effects of Faculty Senate Actions/Decisions

Decisions made have:

	Year	Checked f	Checked %
Changed my teaching	Y1	7	4.4
	Y2	6	5.3
	Y3	15	8.2
	Tot	28	6.1
Changed school leadership practices	Y1	77	48.1
	Y2	42	37.2
	Y3	60	32.6
	Tot	179	39.2
Changed school policies and goals	Y1	72	45.0
	Y2	48	42.5
	Y3	90	48.9
	Tot	210	46.0
Changed instructional practices/ curriculum	Y1	38	23.8
	Y2	35	31.0
	Y3	67	36.4
	Tot	140	30.6
Affected students	Y1	75	46.9
	Y2	70	61.9
	Y3	100	54.3
	Tot	245	53.6
Affected community/parents	Y1	33	20.6
	Y2	35	31.0
	Y3	60	32.6
	Tot	128	28.0
Supported by me	Y1	111	69.4
	Y2	72	63.7
	Y3	114	62.0
	Tot	297	65.0
Supported by majority of faculty	Y1	129	80.6
	Y2	96	85.0
	Y3	141	76.6
	Tot	366	80.1
Supported by administration at school	Y1	92	57.5
	Y2	55	48.7
	Y3	85	46.2
	Tot	232	50.8
Supported by central administration	Y1	27	16.9
	Y2	18	15.9
	Y3	33	17.9
	Tot	78	17.1